

**REMARKS:**

Claims 1-31 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,128,759 to Hansen ("Hansen") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,510,420 B1 to Cessna et al. ("Cessna") in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,360,332 B1 to Weinberg et al. ("Weinberg").

A Final Office Action in the subject application was mailed to the undersigned on 14 July 2005, which provides for a response period ending 14 October 2005. The Applicants filed an Amendment After Final on 9 August 2005, within two (2) months of the date of the Final Office Action. An Advisory Action was mailed to the undersigned on 26 August 2005. The Advisory Action stated that the proposed Amendments filed on 9 August 2005 will not be entered because the amendments to claims 2-11, 13-21, and 23-31 require further search and/or consideration and represent a new issue that would have to be searched before a proper allowance/rejection decision could be made. (26 August 2005 Advisory Action, Page 1). The Applicants respectfully reiterate here the arguments set forth in the Amendment After Final filed on 9 August 2005, as if fully set forth herein.

This Amendment is being filed prior to the ending of the response period 14 October 2005 of the Final Office Action mailed on 14 July 2005. By this Amendment, independent claims 1, 12, and 22 have been canceled without prejudice and claims 2, 13, and 23 have been amended to place claims 2, 13, and 23 in independent form and to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the Applicants invention. In addition, claims 3-11, 14-21, and 24-31 have been amended to correct certain dependencies. By making these amendments, the Applicants make no admission concerning the merits of the Examiner's rejection, and respectfully deny any statement or averment of the Examiner not specifically addressed. Particularly, the Applicants reserve the right to file additional claims in this Application or through a continuation patent application of substantially the same scope of originally filed independent claims 1, 12, and 22. No new matter has been added.

**SPECIFICATION OBJECTION:**

The Applicants thank the Examiner for withdrawing the objection to the specification in the previous Office Action mailed 14 July 2005.

**RESPONSE TO EXAMINERS REMARKS OF 14 JULY 2005 OFFICE ACTION:**

The Applicants thank the Examiner for fully considering Applicants arguments in the previous Office Action response filed on 2 May 2005. However, the Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has mischaracterized the Applicants remarks in the Office Action Response filed on 2 May 2005. The Applicants do not understand why the mischaracterization is set forth in the subject Office Action and respectfully requests further explanation from the Examiner. The Examiner may call the undersigned at (817) 447-9955 if the Examiner believes that it would be easier to discuss the source of confusion over the phone. Thus, the Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiners assertions regarding these mischaracterizations.

Specifically, the Examiner asserts that the Applicants argue that Hansen, Cessna, and Weinberg fail to disclose, teach or suggest each and every element of claims 1-31, of which the Applicants agree. However, the Examiner then contradicts this argument by asserting that the Examiner agrees that Hansen in combination with Cessna and Weinberg meets each and every limitation of claims 1-31. (14 July 2005 Final Office Action, Page 4). The Applicants respectfully disagree with this assertion and do not understand what the Examiner is agreeing with. The Applicants reiterate their argument set forth in the previous Office Action Response filed on 2 May 2005 and hereby incorporate all arguments and remarks set forth in the previous Office Action response filed on 2 May 2005 as if fully set forth herein. The Applicants further reiterate here the arguments set forth in the Amendment After Final filed on 9 August 2005, as if fully set forth herein.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):**

Claims 1-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Hansen in view of Cessna and in further view of Weinberg. (14 July 2005 Final Office Action, Page 3).

Although the Applicants believe claims 1-31 are directed to patentable subject matter without amendment, the Applicants have canceled claims 1, 12, and 22 without prejudice, and amended claims 2, 13, and 23 to place claims 2, 13, and 23 in independent form, and to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the Applicants invention. In addition, claims 3-11, 14-21, and 24-31 have been amended to correct certain dependencies. By making these amendments, the Applicants do not indicate agreement with or acquiescence to the Examiner's position with respect to the rejections of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as set forth in the Office Action.

The Applicants respectfully submit that Hansen, Cessna, or Weinberg either individually or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest each and every element of claims 2-11, 13-21, and 23-31. Thus, the Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiners obvious rejection of claims 1-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the proposed combination of Hansen, Cessna, and Weinberg either individually or in combination.

For example, with respect to now amended independent claim 2, this claim recites:

A method for selecting members in a hierarchy, comprising:  
receiving input of a user from a member selection interface;  
determining a sequence of one or more actions associated with a member selection tree, the actions collectively selecting one or more members from a hierarchy of members, the hierarchy of members being associated with a particular dimension of an organization of data;  
recording the sequence of actions of the user in a member selection script; and  
executing the recorded member selection script to generate a new selection of members based upon the members and hierarchical relationships of the users original inputs, after the hierarchy of members has been modified. (Emphasis Added).

Amended independent claims 13 and 23 recite similar limitations. Hansen, Cessna, and Weinberg either individually or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest each and every limitation of amended independent claims 2, 13, and 23.

The Applicants have reviewed Hansen in detail, particularly looking for selecting and recording members in a hierarchy, relied upon by the Examiner. However, Hansen fails to disclose, teach or even hint at a method, a system, or even software for selecting and recording members in a hierarchy. Thus, the Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's assertions regarding the subject matter disclosed in Hansen.

The Applicants respectfully submit that Hansen has nothing to do with amended independent claim 2 limitations regarding a method, a system, or even software for selecting and recording members in a hierarchy. Rather Hansen discloses a flexible test environment for test equipment (Abstract). Hansen merely discloses an environment for developing and executing test development steps as they relate to the test program execution steps. Hansen does not disclose, teach, or suggest selecting members in a hierarchy including: (1) receiving input of a user from a member selection interface; (2) determining a sequence of actions associated with a member selection tree, the actions selecting members from a hierarchy of members associated with a dimension of an organization of data; (3) recording the sequence of actions of the user in a member selection script; or (4) executing the recorded member selection script to generate a new selection of members based upon the members and hierarchical relationships of the users original inputs, after the hierarchy of members has been modified.

The Applicants further submit that Hansen does not disclose, teach, or suggest receiving input of a user from a member selection interface. In fact, the Office Action is in essence, silent as to any disclosure, teaching, or suggestion within Hansen to receiving input of a user from a member selection interface. The Office Action merely states that the limitation is somehow set forth in the references. (14 July 2005 Final Office Action, Page 5). The Applicants respectfully submit that this type of conclusory statement is insufficient to support a finding of obviousness. Thus, Hansen cannot provide for selecting and

recording members in a hierarchy, since, Hansen does not even provide for receiving input of a user from a member selection interface.

The Applicants still further submit that Hansen does not determine a sequence of actions associated with a member selection tree, the actions collectively selecting members from a hierarchy of members, the hierarchy of members associated with a dimension of an organization of data. In fact, the Office Action acknowledges, and the Applicants agree, that Hansen fails to disclose the hierarchy of members being associated with a particular dimension of an organization of data. (14 July 2005 Final Office Action, Page 4). The Applicants direct the Examiner's attention to the cited portions of Hansen, relied upon by the Examiner:

It would therefore be desirable to have a tester [automatic test equipment to test both semiconductor devices and assembled printed circuit boards to determine whether the devices and boards are defective] that facilitates the development, execution, and documentation of complex test sequences [both analog and digital tests for mixed-signal devices or boards]. Such a tester [automatic test equipment to test both semiconductor devices and assembled printed circuit boards to determine whether the devices and boards are defective] would clearly communicate the organization and structure of these test sequences [both analog and digital tests for mixed-signal devices or boards] and related documentation to the tester operator through the user interface. (Column 3, Line 33-38). (Emphasis Added).

The Applicants respectfully submit that the above cited text of Hansen has nothing to do with amended independent claim 2 limitations regarding determining a sequence of actions associated with a member selection tree, the actions collectively selecting members from a hierarchy of members, the hierarchy of members associated with a dimension of an organization of data. Thus, Hansen cannot provide for collectively selecting one or more members from a hierarchy of members, associated with a particular dimension of an organization of data associated with a member selection tree, since Hansen does not even provide for the hierarchy of members being associated with a particular dimension of an organization of data, as acknowledged by the Office Action.

The Applicants yet further submit that Hansen does not disclose executing the recorded member selection script to generate a new selection of members based upon the

members and hierarchical relationships of the users original inputs, after the hierarchy of members has been modified. In fact, the Office Action acknowledges, and the Applicants agree, that Hansen fails to disclose recording the sequence of actions in a member selection script. (14 July 2005 Final Office Action, Page 4). Thus, Hansen cannot execute the recorded member selection script, since, as acknowledged by the Office Action, Hansen does not even record a member selection script in the first place. Furthermore, Hansen cannot generate a new selection of members based upon the members and hierarchical relationships of the users original inputs, since Hansen does not even collectively select a member from a hierarchy of members in the first place.

The Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action acknowledges, and the Applicants agree, that Hansen fails to disclose the emphasized limitations noted above in amended independent claim 2. Specifically the Examiner acknowledges that Hansen fails to disclose the hierarchy of members being associated with a particular dimension of an organization of data. (14 July 2005 Final Office Action, Page 4). However, the Examiner asserts that the cited portions of Cessna disclose the acknowledged shortcomings in Hansen. The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiners assertions regarding the subject matter disclosed in Cessna.

The Applicants respectfully submit that Cessna has nothing to do with the amended independent claim 2 limitations regarding determining a sequence of actions that collectively select members from a hierarchy of members associated with a particular dimension of an organization of data. Rather, Cessna describes an approach a planner may use to view data at a predetermined granularity. (Column 1, Lines 33-42). This approach merely allows a planner to view arbitrary data at different levels within a hierarchy and has nothing to do with determining a sequence of actions associated with a particular dimension of an organization of data. Thus Cessna cannot determine a sequence of actions associated with a member selection tree, since Cessna does not even collectively select members from a hierarchy of members associated with a particular dimension of an organization of data.

The Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action has failed to properly establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness based on the proposed combination of Hansen and Cessna, either individually or in combination. The Office Action has not shown the required teaching, suggestion, or motivation in Hansen or Cessna, to combine the references as proposed. The Office Action merely states that portions of the claimed method would have been a highly desirable feature in this art for dynamically building hierarchical groupings of business information based on member characteristics. (14 July 2005 Final Office Action, Page 4). The Applicants respectfully disagree.

The Applicants further submit that this purported advantage relied on by the Examiner to make such a combination is nowhere disclosed, taught, or suggested in Hansen or Cessna, either individually or in combination. The Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to point to the portions of Hansen or Cessna, which contain the teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine Hansen and Cessna for the purpose of dynamically building hierarchical groupings of business information based on member characteristics. A recent Federal Circuit case makes it crystal clear that, in an obviousness situation, the prior art must disclose each and every element of the claimed invention, and that any motivation to combine or modify the prior art must be based upon a suggestion in the prior art. *In re Lee*, 61 U.S.P.Q.2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 2002). (Emphasis Added). Conclusory statements regarding common knowledge and common sense are insufficient to support a finding of obviousness. *Id.* at 1434-35. Thus, the Office Action fails to provide proper motivation for combining the teachings of Hansen or Cessna, either individually or in combination.

The Applicants further submit that the Office Action acknowledges, and the Applicants agree, that both Hansen and Cessna, either individually or in combination, further fail to disclose the limitations noted above in amended independent claim 2. Specifically the Examiner acknowledges that both Hansen and Cessna fail to disclose recording the sequence of actions of the user in a member selection script. (14 July 2005 Final Office Action, Page 4). However, the Examiner asserts that Weinberg discloses the acknowledged shortcomings in Hansen and Cessna. The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiners assertions regarding the subject matter disclosed in Weinberg.

The Applicants have reviewed Weinberg in detail; particularly looking for limitations as recited in amended independent claim 2 regarding recording the sequence of actions of the user in a member selection script, relied upon by the Examiner. However, Weinberg fails to disclose teach, or suggest the Applicants claimed invention. Rather, Weinberg discloses a testing tool for testing the functionality of a transactional server where a series of user steps are recorded. (Abstract, Figures 6A-6C). The testing tool in Weinberg merely displays these recorded user steps to allow for verification of expected server responses and fails to disclose, teach or even hint at recording the sequence of actions as recited in amended independent claim 2. (Abstract). (Emphasis Added). In fact Weinberg teaches away from the claimed invention because the recorder module of Weinberg merely records the particular members that the user selects, i.e. business process steps. (Figures 6A-6C). Weinberg does not disclose, teach, or suggest recording the sequence of events (actions) that the user went through to determine the members that are selected.

The Applicants further submit that Weinberg fails to disclose, teach, or suggest generating a new selection of members based upon the members and hierarchical relationships of the users original inputs, after the hierarchy of members has been modified. Rather Weinberg discloses creating a test script when the recorder module records the particular members that the user selects. (Figures 6A-6C). Weinberg merely discloses a hard coded set of members used to perform a particular business process which may become out of date and have to be recreated when members of Weinberg's hierarchical dimension are added or deleted. Weinberg does not disclose, teach, or suggest executing this sequence of events (actions) once the hierarchy is modified and thereafter produce a new selection of members that satisfies the user's original intent. Thus, Weinberg cannot provide for: (1) recording the sequence of actions of the user in a member selection script; or (2) executing the recorded member selection script to generate a new selection of members based upon the members and hierarchical relationships of the users original inputs, after the hierarchy of members has been modified, since Weinberg does not provide for (1) recording the sequence of events (actions) that the user went through to determine the members that are selected; or (2) executing this sequence of events (actions) once the hierarchy is modified and thereafter produce a new selection of members that satisfies the user's original intent.

The Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has inappropriately applied hindsight when combining the teaching of Weinberg with the teachings of Hansen and Cessna in order to arrive at the claimed invention recited in amended independent claim 2. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that portions of the claimed method would have been a highly desirable feature in this art for editing tests without knowing a scripting or other programming language. (14 July 2005 Final Office Action, Page 4). The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiners assertions. The Applicants respectfully request clarification as to what the Examiner means by "portions of the claimed method would have been a highly desirable feature" and how these "portions" relate to Applicants claimed invention, as recited in amended independent claim 2. The Applicants further submit that the reasoning relied on by the Examiner of editing tests without knowing a scripting or other programming language are examples of hindsight inappropriately applied to reach the claimed invention as recited in amended independent claim 2.

The Applicants further submit that the Office Action has failed to properly establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness based on the proposed combination of Hansen, Cessna, and Weinberg, either individually or in combination. The Office Action has not shown the required teaching, suggestion, or motivation in Hansen, Cessna, or Weinberg, to combine the references as proposed. The Office Action merely states that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made, to modify Hansen for the purpose of dynamically building hierarchical groupings of business information as well as editing tests without knowing a programming language. (14 July 2005 Final Office Action, Pages 4-5). The Applicants respectfully disagree.

The Applicants still further submit that these purported advantages relied on by the Examiner to make such a combination are nowhere disclosed, taught, or suggested in Hansen, Cessna, or Weinberg, either individually or in combination. The Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to point to the portions of Hansen, Cessna, or Weinberg, which contain the teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine Hansen, Cessna, or Weinberg for the purpose of dynamically building hierarchical groupings of business information as well as editing tests without knowing a programming language. The Applicants further request the Examiner to clarify how these purported advantages of

dynamically building hierarchical groupings of business information as well as editing tests without knowing a programming language relate to the claimed invention as recited in amended independent claim 2. For example, the Applicants direct the Examiner's attention to amended independent claim 2, recited above, and respectfully request the Examiner to show how these purported advantageous, relied on by the Examiner, are part of the claimed invention. A recent Federal Circuit case makes it crystal clear that, in an obviousness situation, the prior art must disclose each and every element of the claimed invention, and that any motivation to combine or modify the prior art must be based upon a suggestion in the prior art. *In re Lee*, 61 U.S.P.Q.2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 2002). (Emphasis Added). Conclusory statements regarding common knowledge and common sense are insufficient to support a finding of obviousness. *Id.* at 1434-35. Thus, the Office Action fails to provide proper motivation for combining the teachings of Hansen, Cessna, or Weinberg, either individually or in combination.

Amended independent claim 2 is considered patentably distinguishable over the proposed combination of Hansen, Cessna, and Weinberg for at least the reasons discussed above. With respect to amended independent claims 13 and 23 each of these claims includes limitations similar to those discussed above in connection with amended independent claim 2. Thus, amended independent claims 13 and 23 are considered patentably distinguishable over the proposed combination of Hansen, Cessna, and Weinberg for at least the reasons discussed above in connection with amended independent claim 2.

With respect to dependent claims 3-11, 14-21, and 24-31; claims 3-11 depend from amended independent claim 2, claims 14-21 depend from amended independent claim 13, and claims 24-31 depend from amended independent claim 23. As mentioned above, each of amended independent claims 2, 13, and 23 are considered patentably distinguishable over the proposed combination of Hansen, Cessna, and Weinberg. Thus, dependent claims 3-11, 14-21, and 24-31 are considered to be in condition for allowance for at least the reason of depending from an allowable claim.

For the reasons set forth herein, the Applicants submit that claims 2-11, 13-21, and 23-31 are not rendered obvious by the proposed combination of Hansen, Cessna, and Weinberg. The Applicants further submit that claims 2-11, 13-21, and 23-31 are in condition for allowance. Thus, the Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2-11, 13-21, and 23-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and that claims 2-11, 13-21, and 23-31 be allowed.

**THE LEGAL STANDARD FOR OBVIOUSNESS REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103:**

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 U.S.P.Q.2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991); M.P.E.P. § 2142. Moreover, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (CCPA 1974). If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988); M.P.E.P. § 2143.03.

With respect to alleged obviousness, there must be something in the prior art as a whole to suggest the desirability, and thus the obviousness, of making the combination. *Panduit Corp. v. Dennison Mfg. Co.*, 810 F.2d 1561 (Fed. Cir. 1986). In fact, the absence of a suggestion to combine is dispositive in an obviousness determination. *Gambro Lundia AB v. Baxter Healthcare Corp.*, 110 F.3d 1573 (Fed. Cir. 1997). The mere fact that the prior art can be combined or modified does not make the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. *In re Mills*, 916 F.2d 680, 16 U.S.P.Q.2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990); M.P.E.P. § 2143.01. The consistent

criterion for determining obviousness is whether the prior art would have suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art that the process should be carried out and would have a reasonable likelihood of success, viewed in the light of the prior art. Both the suggestion and the expectation of success must be founded in the prior art, not in the Applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 U.S.P.Q.2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991); *In re O'Farrell*, 853 F.2d 894 (Fed. Cir. 1988); M.P.E.P. § 2142.

A recent Federal Circuit case makes it clear that, in an obviousness situation, the prior art must disclose each and every element of the claimed invention, and that any motivation to combine or modify the prior art must be based upon a suggestion in the prior art. *In re Lee*, 61 U.S.P.Q.2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 2002). Conclusory statements regarding common knowledge and common sense are insufficient to support a finding of obviousness. *Id.* at 1434-35.

**CONCLUSION:**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is considered to be in condition for allowance, and early reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

A Request for Continued Examination (RCE) is being filed in duplicate concurrently herewith to facilitate the processing of this deposit account authorization. **The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the RCE Fee of \$790.00 to Deposit Account No. 500777.** Because the Amendment After Final was filed within two (2) months of the date of the Final Office Action and this Amendment is filed prior to the ending of the response period 14 October 2005 of the Final Office Action mailed on 14 July 2005, no additional fees are deemed to be necessary; however, the undersigned hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge any additional fees that may be required, or credit any overpayments, to **Deposit Account No. 500777.**

**Please link this application to Customer No. 53184 so that its status may be checked via the PAIR System.**

Respectfully submitted,

9/20/05

Date



James E. Walton, Registration No. 47,245  
Brian E. Harris, Registration No. 48,383  
Steven J. Laureanti, Registration No. 50,274  
Daren C. Davis, Registration No. 38,425  
Michael Alford, Registration No. 48,707  
Law Offices of James E. Walton, P.L.L.C.  
1169 N. Burleson Blvd., Suite 107-328  
Burleson, Texas 76028  
(817) 447-9955 (voice)  
(817) 447-9954 (facsimile)  
[jim@waltonpllc.com](mailto:jim@waltonpllc.com) (e-mail)

**CUSTOMER NO. 53184**  
**ATTORNEYS AND AGENTS FOR APPLICANTS**